

Criteria for Prioritizing Team Projects, Programs and Initiatives

MCH Project: Early Childhood Systems

1. PUBLIC VALUE. <i>Using the most current and well researched information is a high public priority with significant public value.</i>	High	Medium	Low	Do not Know
○ Taxpayers, public officials and other key stakeholders recognize and value the benefits of addressing <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> .				
○ Early Childhood Systems affects a significant or underserved population.				
○ It is likely that efforts in <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> will eventually result in reductions in public costs.				
○ Focusing on <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> builds community capacity to address this issue now and in the future.				
○ <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> is viewed by _____, (select your audience: taxpayers, public officials, funders, programs) as one that is appropriate for this agency to address.				
2. RESOURCES. There are enough resources to address <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> .	High	Medium	Low	DNK
○ The scientific knowledge base is sufficient to guide prudent and effective action.				
○ Stakeholders possess the necessary expertise to act.				
○ Our organization has the needed technological infrastructure to implement.				
○ Available funds are adequate to meet the scope of the proposed plan.				
○ A reasonable timeline exists to implement this plan.				
3. FIT/MISSION & VALUES. <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> is a good fit for our organization.	High	Medium	Low	DNK
○ <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> work is consistent with the values and mission of our organization.				
○ Leadership has indicated support and commitment to this plan.				
○ Staff members are supportive and committed.				

○ <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> draws on our organizational strengths and is consistent with our organizational niche.				
○ There are few political costs to this plan.				
○ There are sufficient political benefits to this plan.				
4. INNOVATION. <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> is innovative and/or anticipates future needs and trends.	High	Medium	Low	DNK
○ <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> is an emerging strategy that will gain in importance.				
○ <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> is innovative and may serve as a model to others.				
5. OPPORTUNITIES/PARTNERS. External opportunities exist to work on <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> .	High	Medium	Low	DNK
○ There are other state, county or community organizations with whom we might partner or share resources.				
○ There state public agencies with whom we might partner or share resources.				
○ Grants or other funding opportunities are available to support <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> or may soon become available.				
6. IMPACT/EFFECTIVENESS. There is evidence that <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> is likely to make a difference.	High	Medium	Low	DNK
○ <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> is an evidence-based program with documented effectiveness.				
○ Evaluation data are available on <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> effectiveness.				
○ Data can be gathered about <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> and their impact.				
○ The research and program theory underlying <i>Early Childhood Systems</i> hold promise that the initiative can have an impact.				

ACTIVITY FOR SETTING PRIORITIES USING CRITERIA

The attached **Criteria for Prioritizing Team Projects, Programs and Initiatives** can be used to generate discussion and prioritize particular programs or initiatives. Below is a suggested process for how these criteria can be used by groups to help them prioritize their work. This process can be used by work teams at any level: administrative groups, state planning teams, state workteams, county offices as well as collaborative groups interested in setting priorities for their work.

- 1)** Review the six criteria presented in the handout. Make sure everyone has a common understanding of what they represent. Discuss whether there are additional criteria that are not included but might be important.
- 2) Assign weights to the criteria:** Start with 100 points. Based on how important people feel particular criteria are to their work, assign a relative weight to each criterion by having the group distribute 100 points across the 6 criteria. For example, 40 points could be allocated to criterion 1 (Significant public value), 20 points to criterion 3 (Organizational fit) and 10 points to each of the other 4 criteria (for a total of 100 points). The assignment can be done by discussion and group consensus or each group member can assign their own weights and individual weights can be averaged together for an overall group weighting. A discussion of the relative weightings of each criterion can help group members better understand the values and priorities that individuals bring to their work and help members explore the values that the organization or work group might use to guide its work.
- 3) Have the group rate a particular program or initiative based on how well it meets each of the 6 criteria.** Using a scale of 6=*Highly Consistent* with the criterion to 1=*Not at all Consistent* with the criterion, rate the program or initiative on each of the 6 criteria. Again, this can be done as a group through discussion and consensus; or individual members can make their own ratings which are then averaged together for an overall rating. Individual ratings can be entered into the attached matrix for comparison and summarizing. Individual differences in how the program was rated on each of the criteria can generate meaningful discussion and lead the team toward consensus.
- 4)** If there is more than one project or initiative to prioritize, this process can be applied to each project and then the final scores compared. When comparing several projects or initiatives with each other, it can be helpful to calculate an overall score for each project. This is done by multiplying how well the program met that criteria (ie. 1 to 6) by the weights assigned to each criteria. Examples follow;

Program A

Criteria	Assigned Weights	Rating of how well Program Meets criteria		SCORE
(1) Significant Public Value	40 pts.	5	(40 X 5) =	200
(2) Adequate Resources	10 pts.	5	(10 X 5)=	50
(3) Good Organizational Fit	20 pts.	5	(20 X 5)=	100
(4) Innovative-Anticipates Future	10 pts.	3	(10 X 3)=	30
(5) External Opportunities Exist	10 pts.	1	(10 X 1)=	10
(6) <u>Programs will have Impact</u>	10 pts.	4	(10 X 4)=	40

TOTAL SCORE = 430

Program B

Criteria	Assigned Weights	Rating of how well Program Meets criteria		SCORE
1) Significant Public Value	40 pts.	2	(40 X 2) =	80
2) Adequate Resources	10 pts.	4	(10 X 4)=	40
3) Good Organizational Fit	20 pts.	3	(20 X 3)=	60
4) Innovative-Anticipates Future	10 pts.	5	(10 X 5)=	50
5) External Opportunities Exist	10 pts.	3	(10 X 3)=	30
6) <u>Programs will have Impact</u>	10 pts.	2	(10 X 2)=	20

TOTAL SCORE = 280